	1		
1	Ryan J. Villa		
2	5501 Eagle Rock Ave NE, Ste C2 Albuquerque, NM 87113 (505) 639-5709		
3			
4	ryan@rjvlawfirm.com		
5	Andrea Lee Luem, PHV		
	400 South Fourth Street, Ste 500 Las Vegas, NV 89101		
6	(702) 575-0481		
7	andrea@luemlaw.com		
8	Attorneys for: KENNETH JOHNSON		
9	IN THE UNITED ST	LATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
1			
12			
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	Criminal case No. 20-CR-238-JLT-SKO	
14	Plaintiff,	REPLY ON MOTION FOR BILL OF PARTICULARS	
15	V.	Date: January 31, 2024	
16		Time: 1:00 p.m. Place: Honorable Sheila K. Oberto	
17	KENNETH JOHNSON,	Courtroom 7	
18	Defendant		
19			
20	Defendant Mr. Kenneth Johnson, by counsel, The Law Office of Ryan J. Villa, by Ryan J		
21	Villa, and Andrea Lee Luem, hereby submits this Reply to the United States' Opposition to th		
22	Motion for Bill of Particulars.		
23	AR	GUMENT	
24			
25	Despite the government's efforts to the contrary in the Opposition, it failed to demonstrat		
26	why the bill of particulars sought by Mr. Johnson is not warranted. To be sure, this Court ha		
7	discretion to grant the bill, and there are distr	rict court cases, with different factual scenarios, that	

come out on either side. Here, given the unique circumstances that Mr. Johnson faces with respect to Counts Two and Three, and the lack of any discovery that would demonstrate how he was involved, a bill of particulars as to his role in the killings, and the VICAR purpose for the killing is essential. While the Opposition brief lauds the indictment's description of the AB prison gang, and why it could be a racketeering enterprise, it fails to acknowledge that the indictment is silent as to how Mr. Johnson murdered the two victims in Counts Two and Three, and why that was connected to any alleged AB enterprise business or would otherwise increase Mr. Johnson's role in the AB.

To be sure, Mr. Johnson concedes that the indictment adequately alleges with specificity why the AB might constitute an enterprise engaged in racketeering. But his Motion does not challenge this aspect of the indictment or seek a bill of particulars on this element, or the racketeering conspiracy alleged in Count One. Instead, he narrowly requests supplemental information on how he participated in the murders, and why those murders had a VICAR purpose. "The bill of particulars' purpose is to supplement the indictment by providing more details of facts upon which the charges are based." *United States v. Short*, 857 F.2d 1479 (9th Cir. 1988). *See United States v. Inryco, Inc.*, 642 F.2d 290, 295 (9th Cir.1981), *cert. dismissed*, 454 U.S. 1167 (1982). Here, there is nothing in the indictment demonstrating how Mr. Johnson could have participated in these murders or why he would have done so. As such, the Court should require a bill of particulars on the government's theory of the case on this matter. *United States v. Giese*, 597 F.2d 1170, 1180 (9th Cir. 1979).

Notably, the government claims that the discovery provided about the murders obviates the need for a bill of particulars. Opposition at 7. The government cites *United States v. Buckner*, 610 F.2d 570, 574 (9th Cir. 1979) for the proposition that when "all relevant facts were disclosed and

Case 1:20-cr-00238-JLT-SKO Document 911 Filed 01/12/24 Page 3 of 3

available, the government is not obliged to disclose" its theory. Here, however, the government		
has not produced one single iota of discovery on how Mr. Johnson participated in the murder o		
why it would aid the enterprise or increase	e his position in the AB. As the Court knows from the	
previous motions litigation on discovery, and can see from the Motion to Compel [Doc. 84], and		
Motion of pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 12(b)(4)(B) [Doc. 885] and the government's Opposition		
to those Motions, [Docs. 904, 905], the government has never claimed that it has in fact disclose		
such discovery. Per Buckner, therefore, the government should be required to provide a bill o		
particulars on these elements of the VICAR murders alleged in Counts Two and Three.		
	Respectfully submitted,	
	/s/ Ryan J. Villa Ryan J. Villa 5501 Eagle Rock Ave NE, Suite C2 Albuquerque, NM 87113 (505) 639-5709 ryan@rjvlawfirm.com /s/ Andrea Lee Luem Andrea Lee Luem, PHV 400 South Fourth Street, Ste 500 Las Vegas, NV 89101 (702) 575-0481 andrea@luemlaw.com	
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE		
I hereby certify that on January 12, 2024 I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing via ECF to:		
All counsel of record		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u>van J. Villa</u> J. Villa	